



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,664	04/23/2001	Bina Kunal Thakkar	230600-430	4136
24239	7590	08/05/2005	EXAMINER	
MOORE & VAN ALLEN PLLC P.O. BOX 13706 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709				RYMAN, DANIEL J
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2665		

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H'A

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/840,664	THAKKAR, BINA KUNAL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel J. Ryman	2665	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: ref. 220 (see para. 6 and Fig. 2) and ref. 1438 (see para. 143 and Fig. 14B). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: ref. 213, 222 (see para. 6-9 and Fig. 2); ref. 316 (see para. 43-44 and Fig. 10); ref. 466 (see para. 78 and Fig. 4); ref. 512 (see para. 100 and Fig. 5); ref. 724 (see para. 123 and Fig. 7); ref. 1308 (see para. 125 and Fig. 13); ref. 1060 (see para. 132-133 and Fig. 16); ref. 1426 and 1426 (see para. 144 and Fig. 14B); and ref. 1900, 1902, 1904, and 1906. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is

being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: in para. 25, 77, and 79, “Fig. 8A-8I” should be “Fig. 8A-8L”; in para. 26 and 114, “Fig. 9A-9E” should be “Fig. 9A-9I”; in para. 115, “Referring to Fig. 9A” should be “Referring to Fig. 9B”; in para. 115, “904 (Fig. 9A)” should be “904 (Fig. 9B)”; in para. 115, “906 (Fig. 9B)” should be “906 (Fig. 9C)”; in para. 115, “908 (Fig. 9B)” should be “908 (Fig. 9C)”; in para. 115, “910 (Fig. 9B)” should be “910 (Fig. 9D)”; in para. 115, “912 (Fig. 9C)” should be “912 (Fig. 9E)”; in para. 115, “914 (Fig. 9C)” should be “914 (Fig. 9F)”; in para. 115, “916 (Fig. 9C)” should be “916 (Fig. 9F)”; in para. 115, “918 (Fig. 9C-9D)” should be “918 (Fig. 9G)”; in para. 115, “920 (Fig. 9D)” should be “920 (Fig. 9G)”; in para. 115, “922 (Fig. 9D)” should be “922 (Fig. 9H)”; in para. 117, “Fig. 9A at 924” should be “Fig. 9B at 924”; in para. 117, “926 (Fig. 9A)” and “928 (Fig. 9A)” should be “926 (Fig. 9B)” and “928 (Fig. 9B)”, respectively for all instances; and in para. 125, “generator 1306” should be “generator 106” to match Fig. 13.

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The application information seen in paragraph 1 and 45 should be updated to reflect any changes in the status of the applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heimsoth et al. (USPN 5,764,915) in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

7. Regarding claims 1, 15, and 16, Heimsoth discloses a method of, apparatus for, and software for encoding field values into a network frame for network transmission, the method and software comprising the steps of and the apparatus comprising means for: receiving at least one unit name (unit's protocol) and at least one value ("all of the necessary information . . . to convey the client request to the appropriate protocol layer object") corresponding to at least one keyword (name of fields in frame, such as payload and specific header fields) associated with the at least one unit name (col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 15, lines 53-55; col. 28, lines 12-30; col. 29, lines 19-21; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 32-36); retrieving protocol knowledge of the data structure of the at least one unit name enabling the building of the at least one keyword into at least one unit (col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21); associating the at least one value with the at least one keyword (col. 28, lines 12-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 32-36) where the value, such as address information, is used to ensure that the user information is sent to the correct location.

Heimsoth does not expressly disclose that the unit is a protocol data unit or that the at least one protocol value is placed into a memory device in at least one protocol data unit data

structure. However, Heimsoth does disclose the use of buffers (col. 28, lines 14-25). Heimsoth also discloses that the user information is transmitted using protocol stacks (col. 1, line 40-col. 2, line 11). Applicant admits as prior art receiving at least one protocol data unit (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12); using protocol knowledge pertaining to the data structure of the at least one protocol data unit to build fields into at least one protocol data unit (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12); and placing the at least one field in at least one protocol data unit data structure (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12). Applicant does this in order to communicate between the layers of a protocol (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12) where a protocol is organized into layers in order to reduce design complexity in transmitting data from one network device to another (paragraph 4). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a protocol data unit and to place the at least one protocol value into a memory device in at least one protocol data unit data structure in order to communicate between the layers of a protocol where a protocol is organized into layers in order to reduce design complexity in transmitting data from one network device to another.

8. Regarding claim 2, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the at least one keyword is at least one field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

9. Regarding claim 3, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the at least one keyword is a payload keyword and at least one field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

10. Regarding claim 4, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the at least one keyword is a header keyword and at least one field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

11. Regarding claim 5, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the at least one keyword is a header keyword, a payload keyword, a trailer keyword, and at least one field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

12. Regarding claim 6, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the protocol knowledge further comprises default values corresponding to the at least one keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

13. Regarding claim 7, incorporating the rejection of claim 1, Heimsoth in view of Applicant discloses each limitation of claim 7, as outlined above in the rejection of claim 1, except receiving at least two protocol data unit names, an order in which the at least two protocol data unit names are to be stacked. However, Heimsoth in view of Applicant further disclose receiving at least two protocol data unit names (unit's protocol), an order in which the at least two protocol data unit names are to be stacked (Heimsoth: col. 1, line 44-col. 2, line 11 and col. 15, lines 10-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12) where the data is sent down a protocol stack such that the names will define the protocols to be used in each layer of the protocol stack.

14. Regarding claim 8, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the at least one keyword is at least one field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28,

Art Unit: 2665

lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

15. Regarding claim 9, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the at least one keyword is a payload keyword and at least one field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

16. Regarding claim 10, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the at least one keyword is a header keyword and at least one field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

17. Regarding claim 11, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the at least one keyword is a header keyword, a payload keyword, a trailer keyword, and at least one field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

18. Regarding claim 12, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the protocol knowledge further comprises default values corresponding to the at least one keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

19. Regarding claim 13, Heimsoth discloses a computer system including an encoder system for transmitting a network frame, containing units, to a network, the computer system comprising: a user interface (col. 4, lines 7-46); a network connection (col. 4, lines 7-46); an encoder system disposed between the user interface and the network connection (col. 4, lines 7-50; col. 28, lines 12-30; col. 29, lines 19-21; and col. 28, lines 60-67), the encoder system

including: a protocol library having protocol knowledge of the data structure of at least one unit name (unit's protocol) enabling the building of at least one keyword (name of fields in frame, such as payload and specific header fields) into at least one unit (col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 6, lines 47-50; col. 15, lines 53-55; and col. 29, lines 32-36); and a protocol encoder connected to the protocol library, the network connection, and the user interface for receiving at least one unit name (unit's protocol) and at least one value corresponding to the at least one keyword associated with the at least one protocol data unit name (col. 28, lines 12-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; col. 29, lines 19-21; and col. 29, lines 32-36).

Heimsoth does not expressly disclose that the unit is a protocol data unit or that the at least one protocol value is placed into a memory device in at least one protocol data unit data structure. However, Heimsoth does disclose the use of buffers (col. 28, lines 14-25). Heimsoth also discloses that the user information is transmitted using protocol stacks (col. 1, line 40-col. 2, line 11). Applicant admits as prior art receiving at least one protocol data unit (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12); using protocol knowledge pertaining to the data structure of the at least one protocol data unit to build fields into at least one protocol data unit (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12); and placing the at least one field in at least one protocol data unit data structure (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a protocol data unit and to place the at least one protocol value into a memory device in at least one protocol data unit data structure since this is well known in the art.

20. Regarding claim 14, Heimsoth in view of Applicant discloses that the system is operable as a network analyzer (Heimsoth: col. 18, lines 23-37).

21. Regarding claim 17, Heimsoth discloses a computer readable memory system encoded with a protocol library (col. 5, lines 35-56 and col. 6, lines 47-50), the protocol library including: at least one field keyword defining a field of a unit of a network frame, the at least one field keyword representing a number of fields that a protocol data unit may contain and the location of the field in the protocol data unit, the field being associated with one of the at least one field keywords (col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 6, lines 47-50; and col. 15, lines 53-55).

Heimsoth does not expressly disclose that the unit is a protocol data unit. However, Heimsoth does disclose that the user information is transmitted using protocol stacks (col. 1, line 40-col. 2, line 11). Applicant admits as prior art receiving at least one protocol data unit (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12); using protocol knowledge pertaining to the data structure of the at least one protocol data unit to build fields into at least one protocol data unit (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12); and placing the at least one field in at least one protocol data unit data structure (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a protocol data unit since this is well known in the art.

22. Regarding claim 18, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests having at least one header field keyword defining a header field of a protocol data unit of a network frame, the header field keyword representing a header field that a network frame may contain and the location of the header field in the network frame, the header field being associated with the header field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

23. Regarding claim 19, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests having at least one trailer field keyword defining a trailer field of a protocol data unit of a network frame, the trailer field

keyword representing a trailer field that a network frame may contain and the location of the trailer field in the network frame, the trailer field being associated with the trailer field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

24. Regarding claim 20, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests having at least one payload field keyword defining a payload field of a protocol data unit of a network frame, the payload field keyword representing a payload field that a network frame may contain and the location of the payload field in the network frame, the payload field being associated with the payload field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

25. Regarding claim 21, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests having length keywords specifying length parameters of associated header keywords, trailer keywords, payload keywords, and field keywords; and value keywords specifying value parameters of associated header keywords, trailer keywords, payload keywords, and field keywords (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

26. Regarding claims 22, 30, and 31, Heimsoth discloses a method of, apparatus for, and software for decoding a network frame, having at least one unit, the method and software comprising the steps of and the apparatus comprising means for: receiving a unit name (unit's protocol) and a network frame having at least one unit (col. 29, lines 32-36); retrieving protocol knowledge of the data structure of the at least one protocol data unit enabling the extraction of the at least one field (col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 14, lines 1-2; col. 15, lines 53-55; and col. 29, lines

Art Unit: 2665

32-36); extracting a value (values in the fields of the frame) from the at least one field of the at least one protocol data unit (col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 14, lines 1-2; and col. 29, lines 32-36) where it is implicit that the values are extracted from the frame; and associating the value with at least one keyword (name of fields in frame, such as payload and specific header fields) (col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 14, lines 1-2; and col. 29, lines 32-36).

Heimsoth does not expressly disclose that the unit is a protocol data unit. However, Heimsoth does disclose that the user information is transmitted using protocol stacks (col. 1, line 40-col. 2, line 11). Applicant admits as prior art receiving at least one protocol data unit (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12); using protocol knowledge pertaining to the data structure of the at least one protocol data unit to extract at least one field (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12); and extracting a value from the at least one field (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a protocol data unit since this is well known in the art.

27. Regarding claim 23, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the at least one keyword at least one field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

28. Regarding claim 24, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the at least one keyword is a payload keyword and at least one field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

Art Unit: 2665

29. Regarding claim 25, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the at least one keyword is a header keyword and at least one field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

30. Regarding claim 26, Heimsoth in view of Applicant suggests that the at least one keyword is a header keyword, a payload keyword, a trailer keyword, and at least one field keyword (Heimsoth: col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 4; col. 28, lines 23-30; col. 28, lines 60-67; and col. 29, lines 19-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12).

31. Regarding claim 27, incorporating the rejection of claim 22, Heimsoth in view of Applicant discloses each limitation of claim 27, as outlined above in the rejection of claim 22, except decoding a network frame having at least two protocol data units, one of the at least two protocol data units being a first layer protocol data unit and each of the at least two protocol data units containing at least one field and a protocol name identifying a next layer protocol. However, Heimsoth in view of Applicant further disclose decoding a network frame having at least two protocol data units, one of the at least two protocol data units being a first layer protocol data unit and each of the at least two protocol data units containing at least one field and a protocol name identifying a next layer protocol (Heimsoth: col. 1, line 44-col. 2, line 11 and col. 15, lines 10-21 and Applicant: Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12) where the data is sent up a protocol stack such that the protocol names are used to define the protocols to be used in each layer of the protocol stack.

32. Regarding claim 28, Heimsoth discloses an apparatus including a decoder for decoding a network frame, containing units, to a network, the apparatus comprising: a user interface (col. 4,

lines 7-46); a network connection (col. 4, lines 7-46); a decoder system disposed between the user interface device and the network connection (col. 4, lines 7-50; col. 28, lines 12-30; col. 29, lines 19-21; and col. 28, lines 60-67), the decoder system including: a protocol library having protocol knowledge of the data structure of at least one protocol data unit enabling the extraction of at least one field (col. 5, lines 35-56 and col. 6, lines 47-50); and a protocol decoder connected to the protocol library, the network connection, and the user interface for receiving a network frame, retrieving protocol knowledge from the protocol library, extracting a value from the at least one field of the at least one protocol data unit, and associating the value with at least one keyword (col. 5, lines 35-56; col. 14, lines 1-2; col. 15, lines 53-55; and col. 29, lines 32-36).

Heimsoth does not expressly disclose that the unit is a protocol data unit. However, Heimsoth does disclose that the user information is transmitted using protocol stacks (col. 1, line 40-col. 2, line 11). Applicant admits as prior art receiving at least one protocol data unit (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12); using protocol knowledge pertaining to the data structure of the at least one protocol data unit to extract at least one field (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12); and extracting a value from the at least one field (Fig. 2-4 and paragraphs 3-12). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a protocol data unit since this is well known in the art.

33. Regarding claim 29, Heimsoth in view of Applicant discloses that the apparatus is operable as a network analyzer (Heimsoth: col. 18, lines 23-37).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Ryman whose telephone number is (571)272-3152. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:00-4:30 with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571)272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DJR

Daniel J. Ryman
Examiner
Art Unit 2665



HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600